

Constraints on warm dark matter from the ionization history of the Universe

Laura Lopez-Honorez,¹ Olga Mena,² Sergio Palomares-Ruiz,² and Pablo Villanueva Domingo²

¹*Service de Physique Théorique, CP225, Université Libre de Bruxelles,
Bld du Triomphe, and Theoretische Natuurkunde,
Vrije Universiteit Brussel and The International Solvay Institutes,
Pleinlaan 2, B-1050 Brussels, Belgium.*

²*Instituto de Física Corpuscular (IFIC), CSIC-Universitat de València,
Apartado de Correos 22085, E-46071, Spain*

In warm dark matter scenarios structure formation is suppressed on small scales with respect to the cold dark matter case, reducing the number of low-mass halos and the fraction of ionized gas at high redshifts and thus, delaying reionization. This has an impact on the ionization history of the Universe and measurements of the optical depth to reionization, of the evolution of the global fraction of ionized gas and of the thermal history of the intergalactic medium, can be used to set constraints on the mass of the dark matter particle. However, the suppression of the fraction of ionized medium in these scenarios can be partly compensated by varying other parameters, as the ionization efficiency or the minimum mass for which halos can host star-forming galaxies. Here we use different data sets regarding the ionization and thermal histories of the Universe and, taking into account the degeneracies from several astrophysical parameters, we obtain a lower bound on the mass of thermal warm dark matter candidates of $m_X > 1.3$ keV, or $m_s > 5.5$ keV for the case of sterile neutrinos non-resonantly produced in the early Universe, both at 90% confidence level.

I. INTRODUCTION

The appearance of the first generation of galaxies, when the Universe was a few hundred million years old, lead to the end of the so-called dark ages of the Universe. The ultraviolet (UV) photons emitted in these galaxies, gradually ionized the neutral hydrogen which had rendered the Universe transparent following the epoch of recombination, in a process known as reionization [1]. However, so far, the exact moment when cosmic reionization took place is not precisely known [2].

The reionization transition in the late Universe increases the number density of free electrons, n_e , which can scatter the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), with a probability related to the optical depth at reionization, τ , i.e., the line-of-sight integral of n_e weighted with the Thomson cross section, and dominated by single-ionized hydrogen and helium states. The effect of free electrons on the CMB temperature anisotropies leads to a suppression of the acoustic peaks by a factor $e^{-2\tau}$ at scales within the horizon at the reionization period, a signature which is very degenerate with the amplitude of the primordial power spectrum, A_s . Nevertheless, the reionization process creates linear polarization on the CMB spectrum due to the scattering between free electrons and the large-scale CMB quadrupole. This signature, usually dubbed as the “reionization bump”, scales as τ^2 and peaks at scales larger than the horizon size at the reionization period, resulting in a determination of τ almost free of degeneracies (see Ref. [3] or corresponding chapter in Ref. [2] for an exhaustive description of the epoch of reionization (EoR) and its impact on the CMB). Measurements by the Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) of the optical depth to reionization, $\tau = 0.089 \pm 0.014$, indicated an early-reionization scenario ($z_{\text{re}} = 10.6 \pm 1.1$) [4], requiring the presence of sources of reionization at $z \gtrsim 10$. This value of τ was somehow in tension with observations of Lyman- α (Ly- α) emitters at $z \simeq 7$ [5–9], which instead pointed out to reionization being complete by $z \simeq 6$. Nevertheless, the results presented by the Planck collaboration in the 2015 public data release, including the large-scale (low- ℓ) polarization observations of the Low Frequency Instrument (LFI) [10] together with Planck temperature and lensing data, indicate that $\tau = 0.066 \pm 0.016$ [11] (see also Ref. [12]). Therefore, analyses of the Planck data questioned the need for high-redshift sources of reionization [13–17]. More recently, an analysis from the Planck collaboration, where unaccounted systematics in the large angular scale polarization data from the High Frequency Instrument (HFI) have been carefully modeled and removed [18, 19], has provided a measurement of the reionization optical depth of $\tau = 0.055 \pm 0.009$ [18] based exclusively on the polarization (commonly named as the EE) spectrum measurements.

Despite its potential to unravel the mean polarization redshift, the measurement of τ provides only integrated information on the free electron fraction x_e and not on its precise redshift evolution, i.e., redshift tomography is not possible. In order to fully characterize such an evolution, upcoming and future measurements of the 21 cm hyperfine transition of neutral hydrogen, which maps its distribution at different redshifts (and thus the distribution of x_e), are mandatory (see, e.g., Refs. [20–23]).

Awaiting future cosmological measurements of the 21 cm transition line, it is important to exploit our current knowledge of the evolution of the total ionized fraction at late times, $\bar{x}_i$. In particular, the redshift dependence of $\bar{x}_i$ allows performing independent and crucial tests of the dark matter (DM) properties, as the free-streaming of

light particles at late times could generate differences on the matter power spectrum with respect to the standard cold dark matter (CDM) case. These differences which could provide information concerning different particle physics models [24–26]. In this regard, much work has been devoted in the literature to set constraints on annihilations/decays of DM particles from effects on the cosmic ionization history [11, 27–65]. In this work, on another hand, we focus instead on testing the possibility of warm dark matter (WDM) via measurements of the ionization fraction close to the EoR. WDM scenarios offer a very interesting alternative to the standard CDM paradigm, as they provide an explanation of large-scale observations, while alleviating the small-scale problems of the CDM standard picture, i.e., the missing satellite [66, 67], the too-big-to-fail [68] and the core-cusp [69, 70] problems.¹ Since WDM particles have non-negligible velocities at high redshifts, structure formation is suppressed at scales below the DM’s free-streaming length, delaying the halo and star formation periods. It is precisely this suppression in the growth of small scale structures what allows solving some of the problems of CDM cosmologies mentioned above [24, 73–87]. Furthermore, if the WDM candidate is identified with a keV sterile neutrino, this could provide the origin for the recently observed X-ray signals in galaxy clusters, the galactic center and the cosmic X-ray background [88–91].

Currently, the most stringent constraints on the WDM particle mass are obtained from the comparison of Ly α forest power spectra observed from distant quasars to the results obtained with hydrodynamical simulations in the non-linear regime, using a power-law temperature-density relation [92]. In combination with CMB data, this technique provides lower limits on the WDM mass of $m_X > 4.17$ keV for a thermal relic and $m_s > 25.0$ keV for a non-resonantly produced sterile neutrino, both at 95% confidence level (CL) [93], improving upon previous bounds [94–100]. Even more stringent limits are found when adding the power spectrum measured for $z = 4.2$ and $z = 4.6$ with the high-resolution HIRES/MIKE spectrographs, $m_X > 4.65$ keV (and correspondingly $m_s > 28.8$ keV) [93] and $m_X > 5.3$ keV [101]. Let us mention as well that the latest Planck optical depth τ data has also offered a unique opportunity to improve the existing bounds on reionization driven by a sterile neutrino WDM, produced via resonant oscillations, that could explain the observed X-ray features at ~ 3.5 keV (see, e.g., Ref. [102] for a recent and complete analysis of such a possibility).

In this work, instead, we adopt a different approach and focus on an *universal* aspect of WDM cosmologies, namely, the delay caused in the reionization process due to the free-streaming of DM particles. We shall constrain the WDM scenario via the most recent measurement of τ from the Planck collaboration [18], together with other constraints on the reionization level and the temperature of the intergalactic medium (IGM) at different redshifts. The small-scale suppression of the matter power spectrum, typical in WDM cosmologies, delays structure formation and consequently, the EoR (see, e.g., Refs. [103, 104]). Exploiting this effect by means of the semi-numerical modeling provided by the 21cmFAST code [105], we shall derive a lower bound on the mass of the WDM particles, devoting special attention to existing degeneracies with the different astrophysical parameters related to the ionization and heating processes close to reionization, induced by UV and X-ray photons, respectively, and to the minimum virial mass (or temperature) above which halos can start hosting galaxies.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section II presents the modeling of the WDM power spectrum and the resulting halo mass function. Section III contains the description of the ionization processes and of the different parameters we consider in our analysis, including a discussion of the crucial parameter degeneracies. In Sec. IV A we describe the data used in our numerical analysis and the results can be found in Sec. IV B. We draw our conclusions in Sec. V.

II. WARM DARK MATTER HALO MASS FUNCTION

In general, WDM scenarios encompass DM candidates having non-negligible velocities at high redshifts, so the growth of structures is suppressed below a free-streaming length of typically one Mpc. When WDM particles are thermally produced, they are assumed to be relativistic at the epoch of decoupling but non-relativistic at the time of matter radiation equality, t_{eq} , where substantial growth of perturbations become possible. A crude estimate of the free-streaming length can then be obtained computing the distance over which such a particle can travel until t_{eq} [106]. This simplified approach allows one to understand that the free-streaming length decreases with increasing m_X but it misses some important points: the logarithmic growth of perturbations during the radiation dominated era and the fact that free-streaming does not instantaneously switch off after t_{eq} . One is thus led to make use of a numerical Boltzmann code so as to accurately account for free-streaming [24]. The resulting suppression of the linear matter power spectrum has been fitted, and can be characterized by [94]

$$T_{\text{WDM}}(k) = (1 + (\alpha k)^{2\nu})^{-5/\nu}, \quad (1)$$

¹ It has been argued that some of these problems could possibly be solved once baryonic physics is properly accounted for (see, e.g., Refs. [71, 72]).

such that the WDM power spectrum can be written in terms of that for CDM as

$$P_{\text{WDM}}(k) = P_{\text{CDM}}(k) T_{\text{WDM}}^2(k) , \quad (2)$$

with $\nu = 1.12$ and the breaking scale

$$\alpha = 0.049 \left(\frac{\text{keV}}{m_X} \right)^{1.11} \left(\frac{\Omega_X}{0.25} \right)^{0.11} \left(\frac{h}{0.7} \right)^{1.22} \text{ Mpc}/h , \quad (3)$$

where WDM has been assumed to account for all the DM and to be a thermal relic (see also Ref. [94] for non-thermal relics).

Around the time of reionization, of interest for this paper, perturbations have long gone non-linear and high-resolution N-body simulations are required to obtain the halo mass function, i.e., the number of halos per unit mass as a function of mass and redshift, which is defined as [107]

$$\frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} = \frac{\rho_{m,0}}{M^2} \frac{d \ln \sigma^{-1}}{d \ln M} f(\sigma) , \quad (4)$$

where $n(M, z)$ is the (comoving) halo number density, $\rho_{m,0} = \Omega_{m,0} \rho_{c,0}$ is the average matter density in the Universe today ($z = 0$), $\sigma^2 = \sigma^2(M, z)$ is the variance of density perturbations and it is a function of the halo mass M and redshift z , and the function $f(\sigma)$ is the first crossing distribution and represents the fraction of mass that has collapsed to form halos per unit interval in $\ln \sigma^{-1}$. The first analytical derivation of $f(\sigma)$, which is expected to be a universal function, by Press-Schechter, assumed a spherical collapse model. They also used the linear growth of primordial fluctuations to calculate the fraction of mass in virialized objects more massive than a given mass by relating it to the fraction of the volume in which the smoothed initial density field is above some threshold density [108, 109]. However, within this model, the number of halos is underpredicted for high masses and low redshifts and overpredicted for low masses and redshifts [110–113]. An improvement was achieved by Sheth and Tormen (ST) using the same Press-Schechter formalism but with an ellipsoidal collapse model instead [114–116], resulting in the first crossing distribution $f(\sigma)$ to be given by [114]

$$f(\sigma) = A \sqrt{\frac{2q}{\pi}} \left(1 + \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{q \delta_c^2} \right)^p \right) \left(\frac{\delta_c}{\sigma} \right) e^{-\frac{q \delta_c^2}{2 \sigma^2}} , \quad (5)$$

where $q = 0.707$ and $p = 0.3$ were obtained by fitting the results of the GIF simulations [117], $A = 0.322$ is the normalization constant so that $\int f(\sigma) d \ln \sigma^{-1} = 1$, and $\delta_c = 1.686$ is the critical overdensity required for collapse at $z = 0$. Although Ref. [116] later proposed $q = 0.75$ in order to reduce the discrepancies with the results of Ref. [107] at large masses, we will use $q = 0.707$ for our default CDM ST halo mass function, following Refs. [78, 118, 119]. On the other hand, we use $q = 1$ as our default value for WDM scenarios, value that has been shown to match WDM simulations [118, 119].

In principle, the differences between WDM and CDM scenarios are encoded, via the modification of the matter power spectrum, in the root-mean-square (rms) variance of density perturbations, which is defined as

$$\sigma^2(M(R), z) = \left(\frac{D(z)}{D(0)} \right)^2 \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} P(k) |W(kR)|^2 , \quad (6)$$

where the redshift dependence is driven by the linear growth function, $D(z)$, $P(k)$ is the linear power spectrum at $z = 0$ computed following Eq. (2) for WDM and $W(kR)$ is the Fourier transform of a filter function. For CDM the filter function is usually taken to be a spherical top-hat (TH) function in real space, on a scale $R^3 = 3 M / (4\pi \rho_{m,0})$, i.e.,

$$W_{\text{TH}}(kR) = \frac{3}{kR} (\sin(kR) - kR \cos(kR)) . \quad (7)$$

This appears to be inadequate to describe WDM cosmologies [83, 103, 118], for which there is a cutoff in the matter power spectrum at small masses. With this choice of filter, the halo mass function increases with decreasing mass, contrary to what is found in WDM simulations. This can be understood by the fact that for a given scale R a large range of unsuppressed scales k contributes to σ^2 and hence to the halo mass function [120]. Instead, it has been argued that the redshift evolution of the WDM suppression of power at small scales observed in N-body simulations is better accounted for by using a sharp- k window, i.e., a spherical top-hat window in k -space [83, 118],

$$W_{\text{SK}}(kR) = \Theta(1 - kR) , \quad (8)$$




FIG. 1. *Top panel:* Root-mean-square density fluctuation $\sigma(M)$ at $z = 0$. *Bottom panels:* Halo mass functions for CDM at $z = 0$ (left) and $z = 4$ (right). For CDM we use $q = 0.707$, see Eq. (5), and a spherical top-hat filter in real space. For WDM, we use $q = 1$ and a spherical top-hat filter in k -space.

where Θ is the Heaviside function. With this choice of window function, the halo mass function can be written as

$$\frac{dn_{\text{SK}}}{dM_{\text{SK}}} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho_{m,0}}{M_{\text{SK}}^2} f(\sigma_{\text{SK}}) \frac{1}{2\pi^2 \sigma_{\text{SK}}^2} \frac{P(1/R_{\text{SK}})}{R_{\text{SK}}^3} \frac{d \ln R_{\text{SK}}}{d \ln M_{\text{SK}}} . \quad (9)$$

In the case, of the spherical top-hat filter in real space, the mass assignment for each scale R_{SK} is unambiguously defined. In contrast, in the case of the sharp- k filter, the mass is not well defined given a scale in real space and needs to be constrained from the results of simulations. Except from the dependence $M_{\text{SK}} \propto R_{\text{SK}}^3$, guaranteed by the spherical symmetry of the filter, a free parameter c has to be introduced such that

$$M_{\text{SK}} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \rho_m (c R_{\text{SK}})^3 . \quad (10)$$

In this work, we take $c = 2.5$ to match the results of simulations [83, 119]. In the following, we will thus use a TH filter for CDM and a SK filter for WDM.

Figure 1 depicts the mass dependence of the rms of matter density fluctuations, $\sigma(M)$, and of the halo mass function in WDM scenarios for the range of WDM masses considered in this work. We compare the results for the CDM case with $q = 0.707$ and a TH filter to those corresponding to WDM scenarios with $q = 1$ and a SK filter. With a TH window function used to describe the CDM case, $\sigma_{\text{TH}}(M_{\text{TH}})$ increases monotonically with decreasing values of M_{TH} . In contrast, for the WDM SK window function, the rms variance increases monotonically for large masses, while it

becomes constant for small masses to account for the free-streaming effects. This is illustrated in the top panel of Fig. 1. The transition between these two regimes is dictated by the abruptness of the cutoff in the linear WDM power spectrum. Notice that, although the shape of $\sigma(M)$ at large masses is similar for WDM and CDM scenarios, their values differ. One should thus take this into account when normalizing the results obtained from 21cmFAST [105].² The bottom panels of Fig. 1 show the resulting halo mass function at redshift $z = 0$ (bottom-left panel) and at $z = 4$ (bottom-right panel). The flattening of $\sigma(M)$ for low halo masses directly induces the suppression of the halo mass function in the WDM cases. For large halo masses, a similar mass dependence for both WDM and CDM at $z = 0$ is found. Let us mention, as reported in Refs. [118, 119], that the sharp- k model typically underestimates the halo abundance at large halo masses especially at large redshifts, even though the discrepancy with the data is greatly reduced for halos defined by a spherical overdensity halo finder algorithm. Thus, the halo mass function model for WDM used here does not exactly reproduce the CDM behavior for large halo masses.

Notice that the model for WDM halo mass function of Ref. [119], which is the one we follow, is very similar to the one used in Ref. [83] except from one point. Based on Ref. [103], the authors of Ref. [83] argue that, due to the WDM residual thermal velocity dispersion at the time of collapse, the growth of collapsing overdensities is suppressed below an effective Jeans mass M_J . Below that mass, the critical overdensity for collapse is larger than in CDM scenarios, so the halo mass function is further suppressed. As mentioned in Refs. [118, 119], such a Jeans mass is however expected to drop significantly once the Universe enters the matter-dominated era and to damp perturbations on scales much lower than the free-streaming length. However, this is already accounted for in the above treatment of the WDM case. Thus, in our treatment of the WDM halo mass function, we do not include the effect of late time velocity contributions and we have modified accordingly the 21cmFAST code to ensure that no extra Jeans mass cutoff at a given M_J has been imposed.

III. IONIZATION AND THERMAL HISTORIES AND WARM DARK MATTER

As mentioned in the introduction, our goal is to constrain WDM models evaluating the impact on the ionization history of the Universe. For this, we study the evolution of the total ionized fraction $\bar{x}_i$ as well as the evolution of the IGM temperature $T_K(\mathbf{x}, z)$. Notice that $\bar{x}_i(\mathbf{x}, z)$ is obtained from two separate contributions. In the *ionized* IGM (once first sources have lighted on) the ionization level is characterized by $Q_{\text{HII}} = \zeta_{\text{UV}} f_{\text{coll}}(> M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}})$ where Q_{HII} denotes the covering factor of the fully ionized HII regions, ζ_{UV} characterizes the UV ionization efficiency (see below) and $f_{\text{coll}}(> M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}})$ is the fraction of mass collapsed into halos with mass large enough ($> M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$) to host star-forming galaxies. The latter is defined in terms the halo mass function introduced in the previous section as

$$f_{\text{coll}}(> M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}) = \int_{M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}} \frac{M}{\rho_{m,0}} \frac{dn}{dM} dM . \quad (11)$$

On the other hand, the local ionized fraction of the *neutral* IGM, $x_e(\mathbf{x}, z)$ is directly coupled to the gas temperature $T_K(\mathbf{x}, z)$ as

$$\frac{dx_e(\mathbf{x}, z)}{dz} = \frac{dt}{dz} (\Lambda_{\text{ion}} - \alpha_A C x_e^2 n_b f_{\text{H}}) , \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{dT_K(\mathbf{x}, z)}{dz} = \frac{2}{3 k_B (1 + x_e)} \frac{dt}{dz} \sum_{\beta} \epsilon_{\beta} + \frac{2 T_K}{3 n_b} \frac{dn_b}{dz} - \frac{T_K}{1 + x_e} \frac{dx_e}{dz} , \quad (13)$$

where $n_b = \bar{n}_{b,0}(1+z)^3(1+\delta_b(\mathbf{x}, z))$ is the baryon number density, k_B the Boltzmann constant, $\epsilon_{\beta}(\mathbf{x}, z)$ the heating rate, which accounts for different processes (among them, X-ray heating), Λ_{ion} the ionization rate, α_A the case-A recombination coefficient, $C \equiv \langle n_e^2 \rangle / \langle n_e \rangle^2$ is the clumping factor, with n_e the electron number density, and $f_{\text{H}} = n_{\text{H}}/n_b$ is the hydrogen number fraction. The total ionized fraction reads (see, e.g., Ref. [121])

$$\bar{x}_i \simeq Q_{\text{HII}} + (1 - Q_{\text{HII}}) x_e . \quad (14)$$

Notice that for the purpose of this work the most relevant contribution to $\bar{x}_i$ is Q_{HII} that drives the ionization fraction around the reionization time.

Once the ionization history is at hand, one can compute the optical depth to reionization, defined as

$$\tau = \sigma_T \int \bar{x}_i n_b dl , \quad (15)$$

where σ_T is the Thomson cross-section and dl is the line-of-sight proper distance.

² For the best fit of the cosmological parameters, $\sigma_8(z=0)|_{\text{TH}} = 0.82$ using the TH filter in real space, while $\sigma_8(z=0)|_{\text{SK}} = 0.48$ using the SK filter.

A. Free astrophysics parameters

For the sake of simplicity and for comparison purposes with other works, we shall describe the ionization and heating history of the IGM in terms of a reduced number of quantities, namely the WDM mass m_X , the ionization efficiency of UV photons ζ_{UV} , the minimum virial temperature $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$ (or equivalently the minimum virial mass $M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$, see below) and the X-ray efficiency ζ_X . In order to obtain the evolution of $\bar{x}_i(z)$ and $T_K(z)$ we make use of the publicly available code **21cmFAST** [105]. Concerning the range considered for the WDM particle mass in the case of thermal relics, we restrict ourselves to the few keV region, $m_X \in [1 - 4]$ keV, where previous related analyses have been focused on.

As mentioned above, the UV ionizing efficiency ζ_{UV} fixes the ionization fraction in the ionized IGM. It can be reexpressed in terms of the fraction of ionizing photons escaping their host galaxy f_{esc} , the number of ionizing photons per stellar baryons inside stars N_γ , the fraction of baryons that form stars $f_\star$, and the mean number of recombinations per baryon $\bar{n}_{\text{rec}}$, as [121]

$$\zeta_{\text{UV}} \simeq 30 \left(\frac{N_\gamma}{4400} \right) \left(\frac{f_{\text{esc}}}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{f_\star}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{1.5}{1 + \bar{n}_{\text{rec}}} \right). \quad (16)$$

As already noted in Ref. [104], suppressing the photon-production efficiency can have similar effects on ionization observables, as for WDM the abundance of low mass halos is suppressed. We allow ζ_{UV} to vary in the range $\zeta_{\text{UV}} \in [5, 105]$ (see, e.g., Ref. [23] for the bounds that could be obtained on this parameter from future 21 cm observations).

Another parameter we allow to vary is $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$,³ which is the threshold temperature for halos hosting star-forming galaxies. The default value in the numerical code **21cmFAST** is $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K, as lower temperatures have been shown to be insufficient to efficiently cool the halo gas through atomic cooling [122–126]. The choice of $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$ can be translated into a minimum virial halo mass value [1]

$$M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}(z) \simeq 10^8 \left(\frac{T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}}{2 \times 10^4 \text{ K}} \right)^{3/2} \left(\frac{1+z}{10} \right)^{-3/2} M_\odot, \quad (17)$$

which implies, e.g., $M_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} \simeq 3 \times 10^7 M_\odot$ at a redshift $z = 10$ for $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K. Following the upper limit $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} \sim 2 \times 10^5$ K quoted in Refs. [121, 127], we shall restrict ourselves to the range $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} \in [10^4 - 10^5]$ K.

Finally, we also vary modestly the X-ray heating efficiency by changing the parameter corresponding to the number of X-ray photons per solar mass in stars, dubbed as ζ_X (see, e.g., Refs. [105, 128]). We consider two values: $\zeta_X = 10^{56} M_\odot^{-1}$ and $5 \times 10^{56} M_\odot^{-1}$, which approximately correspond to $N_X \simeq 0.1$ and 0.5 X-ray photons per stellar baryon. Although this range is consistent with the observed integrated 0.5 – 8 keV luminosity at $z = 0$ [129], we note that significant uncertainties exist [130–132]. Nevertheless, given the degeneracies in the current analysis,⁴ we restrict ζ_X to that limited range.

B. Parameter degeneracies

In Fig. 2 we show the total ionized fraction, $\bar{x}_i$, as a function of redshift for different ionization histories. In both panels we illustrate the redshift evolution of $\bar{x}_i$ for four values of the WDM particle mass: $m_X = 1$ keV (black curves), 2 keV (red curves), 3 keV (blue curves) and 4 keV (magenta curves); and for three values of the UV ionizing efficiency $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 5$ (dotted curves), 30 (solid curves) and 80 (dashed curves). In the left panel, the minimum virial temperature is fixed to $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K whereas in the right panel it is fixed to $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^5$ K. In both panels, we also depict some of the measurements and limits currently available on $\bar{x}_i$, that are described in the following section. Notice that, while both panels have been produced for a value of the X-ray efficiency $\zeta_X = 10^{56} M_\odot^{-1}$, the results are not very sensitive to this parameter, given the limited range considered here.⁵ Notice also that there exists a degeneracy between ζ_{UV} and m_X . Indeed, a lower value of the WDM mass, which implies a larger small-scale suppression and thus, a larger departure from the CDM picture, would delay structure formation and therefore the entire reionization process, and this can be compensated by a larger UV ionization efficiency. For instance, for $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K, the $\bar{x}_i(z)$ curves for the $m_X = 2$ keV, $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 80$ case (red dashed curve) and those for the $m_X = 4$ keV, $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 30$ case (magenta solid curve)

³ We take the same threshold temperature $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$ for halos hosting ionizing and X-ray sources.

⁴ In the case of $\bar{x}_i(z)$, a value of ζ_X larger than the range considered here can be approximately traded off for a larger value of $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$ or a lower value of ζ_{UV} .

⁵ This is expected, as in scenarios in which the usual parameters have values close to the canonical ones, X-rays only account for a few percent of the total fraction of ionization. On the other hand, a larger contribution from X-rays can have an important impact on more extreme scenarios [121].




FIG. 2. Total ionized fraction, $\bar{x}_i$, as a function of redshift for different reionization histories, for four values of the WDM particle mass: $m_{\text{WDM}} = 1$ keV (black curves), 2 keV (red curves), 3 keV (blue curves) and 4 keV (magenta curves); and for three possible values of the UV ionizing efficiency: $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 5$ (dotted curves), 30 (solid curves) and 80 (dashed curves); fixing the minimum virial temperature to $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K (left panel) and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^5$ K (right panel). For all cases we use $\zeta_X = 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. We also illustrate some of the measurements and limits currently available on $\bar{x}_i$ at a number of redshifts. See the main text for details.




FIG. 3. Redshift evolution of the IGM temperature, T_K . Same color code for all curves as in Fig. 2, except from the fact that now the X-ray efficiency is fixed to $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. As in Fig. 2, $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K (left panel) and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^5$ K (right panel). The data points illustrate the measurements considered here for our numerical analyses. We only show the temperature evolution for redshifts for which $\bar{x}_i(z) < 1$. See Sec. IV A for details.

are almost identical and they are constrained exactly in the same way from measurements and limits on $\bar{x}_i(z)$. Notice that the ζ_{UV} and m_X degeneracy can not be broken by using the Planck results for the optical depth to reionization because τ is an integrated quantity of $\bar{x}_i$ over redshift.

Fortunately, measurements of the IGM temperature $T_K(z)$ can help in alleviating some of the degeneracies discussed above. Nevertheless, using **21cmFast**, we cannot compute the IGM temperature in the fully ionized phase [105]. As a consequence, when reionization is complete for a given model (i.e., $\bar{x}_i(z) \simeq 1$), we cannot compare our simulation results with the measurements of $T_K(z)$. In our analysis, we only use the temperature data (see next section) at redshifts for which $\bar{x}_i(z) < 0.95$. Given that the range of ζ_X considered here does not affect significantly the ionization history, the impact of ζ_X on $T_K(z)$ in the relevant redshift range is small. Similarly to Fig. 2, in Fig. 3 we show the evolution of the IGM temperature for redshifts such that $\bar{x}_i(z) < 0.95$, which are the ones we use, when applicable,

to set constraints. Four values of the WDM particle mass: $m_X = 1$ keV (black curves), 2 keV (red curves), 3 keV (blue curves) and 4 keV (magenta curves); as well as three possible values of the UV ionizing efficiency $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 5$ (dotted curves), 30 (solid curves) and 80 (dashed curves) are shown. The minimum virial temperature is again set to $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K (left panel) and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^5$ K (right panel). In contrast to Fig. 2, here we set $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. Notice that, for example for $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 80$ and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K, we only show the $m_X = 1$ keV case (black dashed curve), as for other WDM masses, reionization is complete at $z \gtrsim 7$. Likewise, for $\zeta_{\text{UV}} = 80$ and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^5$ K, we only show the temperature evolution for the $m_X = 1$ keV (black dashed curve) and 2 keV (red dashed curve) cases. This results in little sensitivity from these data set to large values of ζ_{UV} , except for the very low m_X region. The data points denote some measurements of the IGM temperature, which are described in the following section.

Let us emphasize that both panels in Fig. 3 have been obtained by setting $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. Lowering the X-ray efficiency would give rise to lower values of $T_K(z)$. However, it would not significantly affect $\bar{x}_i(z)$ (in the range of ζ_X we consider) and hence, as temperature data are only used when reionization is complete, it would just worsen a bit the fit for small m_X or low ζ_{UV} , but without changing the results for large m_X or high ζ_{UV} . Notice that this degeneracy between m_X and ζ_{UV} is very similar to the one found in the case of $\bar{x}_i$, i.e., the effect of a smaller value of the WDM mass can be compensated by increasing the UV ionization efficiency.

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

A. Data sets

The optical depth from the last-scattering surface to reionization, τ , provides information of the integrated ionization history of the Universe and impacts the CMB spectrum, so that constraints on the reionization period can be obtained by means of its determination with CMB data. For our numerical analyses, we have imposed a Gaussian prior on the Planck result: $\tau = 0.055 \pm 0.009$ [18]. We compute the redshift evolution of the total ionized fraction, $\bar{x}_i(z)$, using the 21cmFAST code [105], as previously explained, and in this way we determine the value of τ for each of the models studied here. In order to add the Planck prior, we have modified the CAMB (Code for Anisotropies in the Microwave Background) Boltzmann solver code [133] to allow for any possible ionization history, including those corresponding to WDM scenarios.

For deriving bounds using the ionization history of the Universe, we use some of the measurements compiled in Ref. [16]. One set of data uses the Gunn-Peterson optical depth from bright quasars at six different redshifts, $z = 5.03, 5.25, 5.45, 4.65, 5.85, 6.10$ [134], whereas another one makes use of the distribution of dark gaps in quasar spectra at $z = 5.6$ and $z = 5.9$ [135]. Both sets of data indicate that reionization is complete by $z \sim 6$. On the other hand, the observations of Ly α emission in star-forming galaxies at higher redshifts ($z \gtrsim 7$), if the behavior at lower redshifts is extrapolated [5, 6, 9, 136–146], indicates that reionization is not complete at those high redshifts. In this work we consider recent results at $z = 7$ and $z = 8$ [8], which use the models of Ref. [138]. In practice, given the precision of our numerical simulations, the Gunn-Peterson measurements imply that reionization should be fully completed at the quoted redshifts and we take their 1σ interval as lower bounds. All these measurements of the total ionized fraction are depicted in Fig. 2, and are included in our numerical analyses in the next section.

Finally, although measurements of the IGM temperature in the post-reionization era cannot be reliably computed with our procedure, we do use recent measurements to constrain models for which reionization is not complete at the redshifts corresponding to the data (see Ref. [147] for a recent compilation). In this work, we use estimates of the IGM temperature for five redshifts, $z \simeq (3 - 5)$, based on Ly α forest flux observations [148] and those obtained by analyzing the absorption line widths in the spectrum of several quasars around $z \simeq 6$ [149]. They are all shown in Fig. 3.

Therefore, in practice, we compute three χ^2 , one for each type of data, and add them up. In the case of the low-redshift data of the ionization fraction, as indicated, we only consider lower bounds. In practice, for each model, at the redshifts corresponding to the data points, there is no contribution to the χ^2 if $\bar{x}_i(z)$ is larger than the measured lower bound. In the case of the data of the IGM temperature, for each model, there is no contribution to the χ^2 for all data points for which $\bar{x}_i(z) > 0.95$.

B. Results

In the following, we present our results exploiting the data previously described and the simulations performed with the 21cmFAST code. The redshift at which simulations start is $z = 35$, which roughly corresponds to the epoch when the first bright sources begin to appear. The simulations stop at $z = 3$, when reionization is expected to be complete. Due to the fact the runs are computationally expensive, we have made a grid in the parameter space and we




FIG. 4. Contours in the (m_X, ζ_{UV}) plane corresponding to 90% CL, for three values of the minimum virial temperature: $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K (left-column panels), 5×10^4 K (middle-column panels) and 10^5 K (right-column panels). The X-ray efficiency is $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$ in all panels. The best-fit value is indicated with a black point, except in the bottom panels, for which it is meaningless (see text). *Top panels*: using only $\bar{x}_i(z)$ data. *Middle panels*: using only the Planck measurement of the optical depth, $\tau = 0.055 \pm 0.009$ [18]. *Bottom panels*: using the IGM temperature data, as described in the text.

have restricted ourselves to the following values: $m_X = 1, 1.5, 2, 3, 4$ keV, $\zeta_{UV} = 5, 30, 42.5, 55, 80, 105$, $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}} = 10^4$ K, 5×10^4 K and 10^5 K, and $\zeta_X = 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$ and $5 \times 10^{56} M_{\odot}^{-1}$. We first start describing the different constraints obtained individually by each of the data sets considered. After that, we present the combined bounds, i.e., those obtained when the measurements of the optical depth to reionization τ , $\bar{x}_i(z)$ and the IGM temperature are all simultaneously considered. This approach helps to understand our final constraints and it also justifies the combination of the different data sets here considered since, as we show, there is no tension among these data sets.

We start with the limits on our parameters obtained from measurements of $\bar{x}_i(z)$ at low redshifts. Focusing on the




FIG. 5. Contours in the (m_X, ζ_{UV}) plane corresponding to 90% CL, for the three data sets shown in Fig. 4: $\bar{x}_i(z)$ (light blue region), τ (light green region) and $T_K(z)$ (light purple region) after profiling over T_{vir}^{min} and ζ_X , and the resulting contour obtained from the combination of them (red region).

(m_X, ζ_{UV}) plane, we find the allowed regions to be rather independent of the adopted value of the X-ray efficiency, ζ_X . In the top panels of Fig. 4, we depict the regions allowed at 90% CL from $\bar{x}_i(z)$ data only, corresponding to $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_\odot^{-1}$, and three possible values of the minimum virial temperature $T_{vir}^{min} = 10^4$ K (left panel), 5×10^4 K (middle panel) and 10^5 K (right panel). By comparing the results in the three panels, one can clearly see the effect of the non-trivial dependence of $\bar{x}_i(z)$ on the minimum virial temperature, as the allowed regions shift to lower values of ζ_{UV} for lower values of T_{vir}^{min} . This is because a lower minimum virial temperature imply an earlier reionization time, which then would requires a lower UV heating efficiency. The best-fit value when using this set of data is obtained for $m_X = 1.2$ keV, $\zeta_{UV} = 105$ and $T_{vir}^{min} = 10^4$ K, with very little sensitivity to the value of ζ_X (the χ^2 is very flat in the direction of this parameter for the range we consider).

Given that the optical depth τ only provides information on the integrated ionization history of the Universe, constraints based on its measurement are less restrictive than those obtained by using the redshift evolution of $\bar{x}_i$ (shown in the top panels of Fig. 4). This can be seen in the middle-row panels of Fig. 4 where we use the Planck result for τ and, analogously to the top panels, we depict the 90% CL allowed contour in the (m_X, ζ_{UV}) plane for $\zeta_X = 5 \times 10^{56} M_\odot^{-1}$ and three values of the minimum virial temperature $T_{vir}^{min} = 10^4$ K (left panel), 5×10^4 K (middle panel) and 10^5 K (right panel). As expected, qualitatively, a very similar behavior to that in the top panels of Fig. 4 is obtained and likewise, these bounds are also insensitive to the specific value of the X-ray efficiency parameter ζ_X within the range we consider. Quantitatively, the allowed regions are larger. In this case, the low- m_X allowed contours remain basically unaffected by changes in the minimum virial temperature, as reionization is considerably delayed and high UV efficiencies are always needed, regardless of the value of T_{vir}^{min} . With this measurement, the best-fit value is obtained for $m_X = 1.6$ keV, $\zeta_{UV} = 58$ and $T_{vir}^{min} = 2.9 \times 10^4$ K, and it is independent on the value of ζ_X (in the range we consider for this parameter).

Let us finish with the discussion concerning the different individual constraints obtained from measurements of the IGM temperature. Similarly to the cases just discussed, in the bottom panels of Fig. 4 we show the 90% CL contour for three values of T_{vir}^{min} in the plane (m_X, ζ_{UV}) . From the comparison to the other panels of Fig. 4, it is clear that the constraints obtained with these two sets of data are correlated. This is expected, as the use of the IGM temperature data is restricted by the ionization history of every model. As we already mentioned, given this correlation, the IGM temperature data has little sensitivity to the variation of ζ_X in the range under consideration. Moreover, it is not

sensitive to large values of ζ_{UV} or m_X , as in those cases the IGM temperature data cannot be used because the reionization is complete at redshifts higher than those at which the IGM temperature has been measured. In this case, we do not provide the best-fit values, as an entire region of the parameter space does not contribute to the χ^2 .

In Fig. 5 we show the 90% CL contours in the (m_X, ζ_{UV}) plane after profiling over the minimum virial temperature $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$ and the X-ray efficiency ζ_X , obtained for the three different data sets described above: the global ionization fraction $\bar{x}_i(z)$ (light blue region), the optical depth τ (light green region) and the IGM temperature $T_K(z)$ (light purple region), and the final bounds after combining these data sets (red region). Note that the χ^2 is very flat along the direction of m_X in the allowed region, which is an indication of the strong degeneracy between the WDM mass and other astrophysical parameters as ζ_{UV} and $T_{\text{vir}}^{\text{min}}$, in particular. Therefore, it is not possible to derive very strong bounds on the WDM mass with the data sets considered here. We find a modest bound on the mass of a thermal WDM candidate of $m_X > 1.3$ keV at 90% CL, very close to the best-fit value. Notice that all these results refer to thermal DM candidates.⁶ In the case of sterile neutrinos non-resonantly produced via active-sterile oscillations [150], thermal equilibrium is never reached. Therefore, the above limit on the mass does not directly apply, but the limits for these two cases can be related [151]. Thus, our bound on the mass of sterile neutrino DM results in $m_s > 5.5$ keV at 90% CL.

Let us finally comment that measurements of the Ly α power spectrum can be also used to constrain the WDM mass and the IGM thermal history via the suppression of power in the matter spectrum and via Jeans and Doppler broadening of the absorption lines [152, 153], respectively. By means of this method the density of neutral hydrogen can be estimated and then used to estimate the total matter density. Indeed, for a given DM scenario, the recently observed cutoff in the Ly α flux power spectrum can be related to the IGM thermal history [99, 154] via a temperature-density relation [92] and more constraining bounds than the ones presented here have been obtained [93–101].

V. CONCLUSIONS

Reionization is one of the processes in the Universe whose knowledge still remains obscure. Measurements of the CMB provide information on the so-called optical depth to reionization. The most recent analysis from the Planck collaboration using the Planck HFI obtained a relatively low value, $\tau = 0.055 \pm 0.009$ [18], based exclusively on the spectrum polarization data. Additional (non-integrated) information on the ionization history of the Universe can also be extracted from measurements of the Gunn-Peterson optical depth or of the damping absorption wings in bright quasar spectra, or from the prevalence of Ly α emission in the spectra of high-redshift galaxies. In addition, measurements of the thermal history, sensitive to the ionization history, are also important.

Another crucial ingredient to understand the formation of structure at late times is the DM nature. While CDM models can satisfactorily explain large scale structure observations, there are a number of discrepancies at small scales between observations and CDM predictions. This small-scale crisis of the CDM paradigm could be alleviated in WDM scenarios for which the associated free-streaming length is larger and thus, fluctuations at small scales would be suppressed, potentially explaining the missing satellite [66, 67], too-big-to-fail [68] and the core-cusp [69, 70] problems. Reionization in WDM cosmologies would be delayed for this very same effect: halo formation processes would be delayed, and so would the onset of reionization. However, the details of reionization are not known accurately and precise determinations of the amount of energy deposited in the IGM in the form of X-ray heating, the UV ionization efficiency and the minimum virial temperature that sets the threshold mass for halos to host star-forming galaxies are only moderately constrained.

In this work, we have considered measurements of the reionization optical depth, the Universe's ionized fraction and IGM temperature data to constrain the mass of the DM particle in WDM scenarios. Using the 21cmFAST code [105], we have performed simulations of different ionization histories in WDM cosmologies, including their corresponding halo mass function, discussed in Sec. II. As described in Sec. III, we have considered four free parameters: the WDM mass, the X-ray heating efficiency, the minimum virial temperature for halos to host galaxies and the UV ionization efficiency. However, there are important degeneracies among these parameters. For instance, the lower the WDM mass the larger the free-streaming length and thus, the longer structure formation delays, which in turn can be compensated by a larger UV ionizing efficiency or a smaller minimum virial temperature. Therefore, given the degeneracies among some of the astrophysical parameters that drive the ionization processes and the WDM mass, i.e., the suppression of the matter power spectrum, obtaining constraints on the minimum mass of the WDM particle with this approach is a difficult task, and finally results in a lower limit of $m_X > 1.3$ keV for a thermal candidate and $m_s > 5.5$ keV for a sterile neutrino non-resonantly produced, both at 90% CL (see Sec. IV). This limit, even if weaker than bounds

⁶ These particles decouple early in the Universe and their temperature today is lower than that of active neutrinos, so that $m_X n_X / n_\nu = m_X (T_X / T_\nu)^3 = 94.1 \Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2 \text{ eV}$, where n_X and n_ν are the number densities of the WDM particle and of active neutrinos and T_X and T_ν are the corresponding temperatures today.

obtained from measurements of the IGM temperature in the post-reionization era [93–101], provides complementary and valuable information from observations of the late Universe.

Finally, let us stress that future measurements of the 21 cm hyperfine transition of neutral hydrogen, which would map its distribution at different redshifts (and thus the distribution of $\bar{x}_i(z)$), are expected to constitute a very useful tool to understand the ionization history of the Universe, and could allow to further test predictions from WDM models [104, 155–159] or even to disentangle the potential signals from DM annihilations or decays in CDM scenarios [33–35, 37, 39, 40, 47, 52, 58, 61, 65].

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank J. Miralda-Escudé for enlightening discussions. We also thank A. C. Vincent, who took part on the initial stages of this work, for useful comments. LLH is supported by the FNRS-FRS and also acknowledges partial support by the Université Libre de Bruxelles, the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office through the Interuniversity Attraction Pole P7/37, the IISN and the Strategic Research Program *High-Energy Physics* of the VUB. OM and PVD are supported by PROMETEO II/2014/050 and by the Spanish Grant FPA2014–57816-P of the MINECO. SPR is supported by a Ramón y Cajal contract, by the Spanish MINECO under grant FPA2014-54459-P and by the Generalitat Valenciana under grant PROMETEOII/2014/049. OM, SPR and PVD are also supported by the MINECO Grant SEV-2014-0398 and by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreements No. 690575 and 674896. SPR is also partially supported by the Portuguese FCT through the CFTP-FCT Unit 777 (PEst-OE/FIS/UI0777/2013).

-
- [1] R. Barkana and A. Loeb, *Phys. Rept.* **349**, 125 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0010468 [astro-ph].
 - [2] A. Mesinger, ed., *Understanding the Epoch of Cosmic Reionization*, Astrophysics and Space Science Library, Vol. 423 (Springer, 2016).
 - [3] C. L. Reichardt, in *Understanding the Epoch of Cosmic Reionization: Challenges and Progress*, Vol. 423, edited by A. Mesinger (Springer International Publishing, 2016) arXiv:1511.01117 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [4] G. Hinshaw *et al.* (WMAP), *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **208**, 19 (2013), arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [5] D. P. Stark, R. S. Ellis, K. Chiu, M. Ouchi, and A. Bunker, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **408**, 1628 (2010), arXiv:1003.5244 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [6] T. Treu, K. B. Schmidt, M. Trenti, L. D. Bradley, and M. Stiavelli, *Astrophys. J.* **775**, L29 (2013), arXiv:1308.5985 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [7] L. Pentericci *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **793**, 113 (2014), arXiv:1403.5466 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [8] M. A. Schenker, R. S. Ellis, N. P. Konidakis, and D. P. Stark, *Astrophys. J.* **795**, 20 (2014), arXiv:1404.4632 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [9] V. Tilvi *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **794**, 5 (2014), arXiv:1405.4869 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [10] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astron. Astrophys.* **594**, A11 (2016), arXiv:1507.02704 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [11] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astron. Astrophys.* (2016), arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [12] M. Lattanzi *et al.*, (2016), arXiv:1611.01123 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [13] A. Mesinger *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **446**, 566 (2015), arXiv:1406.6373 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [14] T. R. Choudhury, E. Puchwein, M. G. Haehnelt, and J. S. Bolton, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **452**, 261 (2015), arXiv:1412.4790 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [15] B. E. Robertson, R. S. Ellis, S. R. Furlanetto, and J. S. Dunlop, *Astrophys. J.* **802**, L19 (2015), arXiv:1502.02024 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [16] R. J. Bouwens *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **811**, 140 (2015), arXiv:1503.08228 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [17] S. Mitra, T. R. Choudhury, and A. Ferrara, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **454**, L76 (2015), arXiv:1505.05507 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [18] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astron. Astrophys.* **596**, A107 (2016), arXiv:1605.02985 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [19] R. Adam *et al.* (Planck Collaboration), *Astron. Astrophys.* **596**, A108 (2016), arXiv:1605.03507 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [20] S. Furlanetto *et al.*, (2009), arXiv:0902.3259 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [21] J. R. Pritchard and A. Loeb, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 086901 (2012), arXiv:1109.6012 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [22] S. R. Furlanetto, in *Understanding the Epoch of Cosmic Reionization: Challenges and Progress*, Vol. 423, edited by A. Mesinger (Springer International Publishing, 2016) pp. 247–280, arXiv:1511.01131 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [23] A. Liu *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 043013 (2016), arXiv:1509.08463 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [24] P. Bode, J. P. Ostriker, and N. Turok, *Astrophys. J.* **556**, 93 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0010389 [astro-ph].
 - [25] R. Adhikari *et al.*, *JCAP* **1701**, 025 (2017), arXiv:1602.04816 [hep-ph].
 - [26] L. Hui, J. P. Ostriker, S. Tremaine, and E. Witten, (2016), arXiv:1610.08297 [astro-ph.CO].
 - [27] S. H. Hansen and Z. Haiman, *Astrophys. J.* **600**, 26 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0305126 [astro-ph].
 - [28] E. Pierpaoli, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 031301 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0310375 [astro-ph].
 - [29] X.-L. Chen and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 043502 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0310473 [astro-ph].

- [30] N. Padmanabhan and D. P. Finkbeiner, *Phys. Rev.* **D72**, 023508 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0503486 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [31] L. Zhang, X.-L. Chen, Y.-A. Lei, and Z.-G. Si, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 103519 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0603425 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [32] M. Mapelli, A. Ferrara, and E. Pierpaoli, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **369**, 1719 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0603237 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [33] Y. A. Shchekinov and E. O. Vasiliev, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **379**, 1003 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0604231 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [34] S. R. Furlanetto, S. P. Oh, and E. Pierpaoli, *Phys. Rev.* **D74**, 103502 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0608385 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [35] M. Valdés, A. Ferrara, M. Mapelli, and E. Ripamonti, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **377**, 245 (2007), [arXiv:astro-ph/0701301 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [36] L. Zhang, X. Chen, M. Kamionkowski, Z.-G. Si, and Z. Zheng, *Phys. Rev.* **D76**, 061301 (2007), [arXiv:0704.2444 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [37] L. Chuzhoy, *Astrophys. J.* **679**, L65 (2008), [arXiv:0710.1856 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [38] A. Natarajan and D. J. Schwarz, *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 103524 (2008), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev.* **D81**, 089905(2010)], [arXiv:0805.3945 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [39] D. T. Cumberbatch, M. Lattanzi, and J. Silk, *Phys. Rev.* **D82**, 103508 (2010), [arXiv:0808.0881 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [40] A. Natarajan and D. J. Schwarz, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 043529 (2009), [arXiv:0903.4485 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [41] A. V. Belikov and D. Hooper, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 035007 (2009), [arXiv:0904.1210 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] S. Galli, F. Iocco, G. Bertone, and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 023505 (2009), [arXiv:0905.0003 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [43] T. R. Slatyer, N. Padmanabhan, and D. P. Finkbeiner, *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 043526 (2009), [arXiv:0906.1197 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [44] G. Huetsi, A. Hektor, and M. Raidal, *Astron. Astrophys.* **505**, 999 (2009), [arXiv:0906.4550 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [45] M. Cirelli, F. Iocco, and P. Panci, *JCAP* **0910**, 009 (2009), [arXiv:0907.0719 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [46] T. Kanzaki, M. Kawasaki, and K. Nakayama, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **123**, 853 (2010), [arXiv:0907.3985 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [47] Q. Yuan, B. Yue, X.-J. Bi, X. Chen, and X. Zhang, *JCAP* **1010**, 023 (2010), [arXiv:0912.2504 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [48] J. Hisano *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83**, 123511 (2011), [arXiv:1102.4658 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] S. Galli, F. Iocco, G. Bertone, and A. Melchiorri, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 027302 (2011), [arXiv:1106.1528 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [50] D. P. Finkbeiner, S. Galli, T. Lin, and T. R. Slatyer, *Phys. Rev.* **D85**, 043522 (2012), [arXiv:1109.6322 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [51] G. Giesen, J. Lesgourgues, B. Audren, and Y. Ali-Haïmoud, *JCAP* **1212**, 008 (2012), [arXiv:1209.0247 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [52] M. Valdés, C. Evoli, A. Mesinger, A. Ferrara, and N. Yoshida, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **429**, 1705 (2013), [arXiv:1209.2120 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [53] T. R. Slatyer, *Phys. Rev.* **D87**, 123513 (2013), [arXiv:1211.0283 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [54] L. López-Honorez, O. Mena, S. Palomares-Ruiz, and A. C. Vincent, *JCAP* **1307**, 046 (2013), [arXiv:1303.5094 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [55] S. Galli, T. R. Slatyer, M. Valdés, and F. Iocco, *Phys. Rev.* **D88**, 063502 (2013), [arXiv:1306.0563 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [56] R. Diamanti, L. López-Honorez, O. Mena, S. Palomares-Ruiz, and A. C. Vincent, *JCAP* **1402**, 017 (2014), [arXiv:1308.2578 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [57] M. S. Madhavacheril, N. Sehgal, and T. R. Slatyer, *Phys. Rev.* **D89**, 103508 (2014), [arXiv:1310.3815 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [58] C. Evoli, A. Mesinger, and A. Ferrara, *JCAP* **1411**, 024 (2014), [arXiv:1408.1109 \[astro-ph.HE\]](#).
- [59] T. R. Slatyer, *Phys. Rev.* **D93**, 023527 (2016), [arXiv:1506.03811 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] M. Kawasaki, K. Nakayama, and T. Sekiguchi, *Phys. Lett.* **B756**, 212 (2016), [arXiv:1512.08015 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [61] L. López-Honorez, O. Mena, A. Moliné, S. Palomares-Ruiz, and A. C. Vincent, *JCAP* **1608**, 004 (2016), [arXiv:1603.06795 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [62] H. Liu, T. R. Slatyer, and J. Zavala, *Phys. Rev.* **D94**, 063507 (2016), [arXiv:1604.02457 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [63] I. M. Oldengott, D. Boriero, and D. J. Schwarz, *JCAP* **1608**, 054 (2016), [arXiv:1605.03928 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] T. R. Slatyer and C.-L. Wu, *Phys. Rev.* **D95**, 023010 (2017), [arXiv:1610.06933 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [65] V. Poulin, J. Lesgourgues, and P. D. Serpico, (2016), [arXiv:1610.10051 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [66] A. A. Klypin, A. V. Kravtsov, O. Valenzuela, and F. Prada, *Astrophys. J.* **522**, 82 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9901240 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [67] B. Moore *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **524**, L19 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9907411 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [68] M. Boylan-Kolchin, J. S. Bullock, and M. Kaplinghat, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **422**, 1203 (2012), [arXiv:1111.2048 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [69] B. Moore, T. R. Quinn, F. Governato, J. Stadel, and G. Lake, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **310**, 1147 (1999), [arXiv:astro-ph/9903164 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [70] V. Springel *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **391**, 1685 (2008), [arXiv:0809.0898 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [71] A. Fattahi *et al.*, (2016), [arXiv:1607.06479 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [72] M. R. Lovell *et al.*, (2016), [arXiv:1611.00005 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [73] A. Knebe, J. E. G. Devriendt, A. Mahmood, and J. Silk, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **329**, 813 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0105316 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [74] P. Colin, O. Valenzuela, and V. Avila-Reese, *Astrophys. J.* **673**, 203 (2008), [arXiv:0709.4027 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [75] J. Zavala *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **700**, 1779 (2009), [arXiv:0906.0585 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [76] R. E. Smith and K. Markovic, *Phys. Rev.* **D84**, 063507 (2011), [arXiv:1103.2134 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [77] M. R. Lovell *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **420**, 2318 (2012), [arXiv:1104.2929 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [78] A. Schneider, R. E. Smith, A. V. Macciò, and B. Moore, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **424**, 684 (2012), [arXiv:1112.0330 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [79] M. R. Lovell *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **439**, 300 (2014), [arXiv:1308.1399 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [80] R. Kennedy, C. Frenk, S. Cole, and A. Benson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **442**, 2487 (2014), [arXiv:1310.7739 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).

- [81] C. Destri, H. J. de Vega, and N. G. Sanchez, *Phys. Rev.* **D88**, 083512 (2013), arXiv:1308.1109 [astro-ph.CO].
- [82] R. E. Angulo, O. Hahn, and T. Abel, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **434**, 3337 (2013), arXiv:1304.2406 [astro-ph.CO].
- [83] A. J. Benson *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **428**, 1774 (2013), arXiv:1209.3018 [astro-ph.CO].
- [84] A. Kamada, N. Yoshida, K. Kohri, and T. Takahashi, *JCAP* **1303**, 008 (2013), arXiv:1301.2744 [astro-ph.CO].
- [85] M. R. Lovell *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **461**, 60 (2016), arXiv:1511.04078 [astro-ph.CO].
- [86] A. D. Ludlow *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **460**, 1214 (2016), arXiv:1601.02624 [astro-ph.CO].
- [87] L. Wang *et al.*, (2016), arXiv:1612.04540 [astro-ph.GA].
- [88] E. Bulbul *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **789**, 13 (2014), arXiv:1402.2301 [astro-ph.CO].
- [89] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, D. Iakubovskiy, and J. Franse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 251301 (2014), arXiv:1402.4119 [astro-ph.CO].
- [90] A. Boyarsky, J. Franse, D. Iakubovskiy, and O. Ruchayskiy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 161301 (2015), arXiv:1408.2503 [astro-ph.CO].
- [91] N. Cappelluti *et al.*, (2017), arXiv:1701.07932 [astro-ph.CO].
- [92] L. Hui and N. Y. Gnedin, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **292**, 27 (1997), arXiv:astro-ph/9612232 [astro-ph].
- [93] C. Yèche, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, J. . Baur, and H. d. M. d. BourBoux, (2017), arXiv:1702.03314 [astro-ph.CO].
- [94] M. Viel, J. Lesgourgues, M. G. Haehnelt, S. Matarrese, and A. Riotto, *Phys. Rev.* **D71**, 063534 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0501562 [astro-ph].
- [95] U. Seljak, A. Makarov, P. McDonald, and H. Trac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 191303 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0602430 [astro-ph].
- [96] M. Viel, J. Lesgourgues, M. G. Haehnelt, S. Matarrese, and A. Riotto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 071301 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0605706 [astro-ph].
- [97] M. Viel *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 041304 (2008), arXiv:0709.0131 [astro-ph].
- [98] A. Boyarsky, J. Lesgourgues, O. Ruchayskiy, and M. Viel, *JCAP* **0905**, 012 (2009), arXiv:0812.0010 [astro-ph].
- [99] M. Viel, G. D. Becker, J. S. Bolton, and M. G. Haehnelt, *Phys. Rev.* **D88**, 043502 (2013), arXiv:1306.2314 [astro-ph.CO].
- [100] J. Baur, N. Palanque-Delabrouille, C. Yche, C. Magneville, and M. Viel, *JCAP* **1608**, 012 (2016), arXiv:1512.01981 [astro-ph.CO].
- [101] V. Iršič *et al.*, (2017), arXiv:1702.01764 [astro-ph.CO].
- [102] S. Bose, C. S. Frenk, J. Hou, C. G. Lacey, and M. R. Lovell, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **463**, 3848 (2016), arXiv:1605.03179 [astro-ph.CO].
- [103] R. Barkana, Z. Haiman, and J. P. Ostriker, *Astrophys. J.* **558**, 482 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0102304 [astro-ph].
- [104] M. Sitwell, A. Mesinger, Y.-Z. Ma, and K. Sigurdson, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **438**, 2664 (2014), arXiv:1310.0029 [astro-ph.CO].
- [105] A. Mesinger, S. Furlanetto, and R. Cen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **411**, 955 (2011), arXiv:1003.3878 [astro-ph.CO].
- [106] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *Front. Phys.* **69**, 1 (1990).
- [107] A. Jenkins *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **321**, 372 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/0005260 [astro-ph].
- [108] W. H. Press and P. Schechter, *Astrophys. J.* **187**, 425 (1974).
- [109] J. R. Bond, S. Cole, G. Efstathiou, and N. Kaiser, *Astrophys. J.* **379**, 440 (1991).
- [110] V. Springel *et al.*, *Nature* **435**, 629 (2005), arXiv:astro-ph/0504097 [astro-ph].
- [111] K. Heitmann, D. Higdon, C. Nakhleh, and S. Habib, *Astrophys. J.* **646**, L1 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0606154 [astro-ph].
- [112] Z. Lukic, K. Heitmann, S. Habib, S. Bashinsky, and P. M. Ricker, *Astrophys. J.* **671**, 1160 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0702360 [astro-ph].
- [113] W. A. Watson *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **433**, 1230 (2013), arXiv:1212.0095 [astro-ph.CO].
- [114] R. K. Sheth and G. Tormen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **308**, 119 (1999), arXiv:astro-ph/9901122 [astro-ph].
- [115] R. K. Sheth, H. J. Mo, and G. Tormen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **323**, 1 (2001), arXiv:astro-ph/9907024 [astro-ph].
- [116] R. K. Sheth and G. Tormen, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **329**, 61 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0105113 [astro-ph].
- [117] G. Kauffmann, J. M. Colberg, A. Diaferio, and S. D. M. White, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9805283 [astro-ph].
- [118] A. Schneider, R. E. Smith, and D. Reed, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **433**, 1573 (2013), arXiv:1303.0839 [astro-ph.CO].
- [119] A. Schneider, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **451**, 3117 (2015), arXiv:1412.2133 [astro-ph.CO].
- [120] J. A. Schewtschenko, R. J. Wilkinson, C. M. Baugh, C. Boehm, and S. Pascoli, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449**, 3587 (2015), arXiv:1412.4905 [astro-ph.CO].
- [121] A. Mesinger, A. Ferrara, and D. S. Spiegel, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **431**, 621 (2013), arXiv:1210.7319 [astro-ph.CO].
- [122] A. E. Evrard, *Astrophys. J.* **363**, 349 (1990).
- [123] A. Blanchard, D. Valls-Gabaud, and G. A. Mamon, *Astron. Astrophys.* **264**, 365 (1992).
- [124] M. Tegmark *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **474**, 1 (1997), arXiv:astro-ph/9603007 [astro-ph].
- [125] Z. Haiman, T. Abel, and M. J. Rees, *Astrophys. J.* **534**, 11 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9903336 [astro-ph].
- [126] B. Ciardi, A. Ferrara, F. Governato, and A. Jenkins, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **314**, 611 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9907189 [astro-ph].
- [127] B. Greig and A. Mesinger, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449**, 4246 (2015), arXiv:1501.06576 [astro-ph.CO].
- [128] P. Christian and A. Loeb, *JCAP* **1309**, 014 (2013), arXiv:1305.5541 [astro-ph.CO].
- [129] S. Mineo, M. Gilfanov, and R. Sunyaev, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **419**, 2095 (2012), arXiv:1105.4610 [astro-ph.HE].
- [130] E. Treister, K. Schawinski, M. Volonteri, P. Natarajan, and E. Gawiser, *Nature* **474**, 356 (2011), arXiv:1106.3079 [astro-ph.HE].
- [131] L. L. Cowie, A. J. Barger, and G. Hasinger, *Astrophys. J.* **748**, 50 (2012), arXiv:1110.3326 [astro-ph.CO].
- [132] A. R. Basu-Zych *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **762**, 45 (2013), arXiv:1210.3357 [astro-ph.CO].

- [133] A. Lewis, A. Challinor, and A. Lasenby, *Astrophys. J.* **538**, 473 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9911177 [astro-ph].
- [134] X.-H. Fan *et al.*, *Astron. J.* **132**, 117 (2006), arXiv:astro-ph/0512082 [astro-ph].
- [135] I. McGreer, A. Mesinger, and V. D’Odorico, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **447**, 499 (2015), arXiv:1411.5375 [astro-ph.CO].
- [136] M. R. Santos, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **349**, 1137 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0308196 [astro-ph].
- [137] S. Malhotra and J. E. Rhoads, *Astrophys. J.* **617**, L5 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0407408 [astro-ph].
- [138] M. McQuinn, L. Hernquist, M. Zaldarriaga, and S. Dutta, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **381**, 75 (2007), arXiv:0704.2239 [astro-ph].
- [139] A. Mesinger and S. Furlanetto, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **386**, 1990 (2008), arXiv:0708.0006 [astro-ph].
- [140] D. P. Stark, R. S. Ellis, and M. Ouchi, *Astrophys. J.* **728**, L2 (2011), arXiv:1009.5471 [astro-ph.CO].
- [141] A. Fontana *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **725**, L205 (2010), arXiv:1010.2754 [astro-ph.CO].
- [142] M. Dijkstra, A. Mesinger, and S. Wyithe, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **414**, 2139 (2011), arXiv:1101.5160 [astro-ph.CO].
- [143] L. Pentericci *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **743**, 132 (2011), arXiv:1107.1376 [astro-ph.CO].
- [144] Y. Ono *et al.*, *Astrophys. J.* **744**, 83 (2012), arXiv:1107.3159 [astro-ph.CO].
- [145] J. Caruana *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **427**, 3055 (2012), arXiv:1208.5987 [astro-ph.CO].
- [146] J. Caruana *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **443**, 2831 (2014), arXiv:1311.0057 [astro-ph.CO].
- [147] E. Puchwein *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **450**, 4081 (2015), arXiv:1410.1531 [astro-ph.CO].
- [148] G. D. Becker, J. S. Bolton, M. G. Haehnelt, and W. L. W. Sargent, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **410**, 1096 (2011), arXiv:1008.2622 [astro-ph.CO].
- [149] J. S. Bolton *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **419**, 2880 (2012), arXiv:1110.0539 [astro-ph.CO].
- [150] S. Dodelson and L. M. Widrow, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 17 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9303287 [hep-ph].
- [151] B. Bozek *et al.*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **459**, 1489 (2016), arXiv:1512.04544 [astro-ph.CO].
- [152] N. Y. Gnedin and L. Hui, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **296**, 44 (1998), arXiv:astro-ph/9706219 [astro-ph].
- [153] T. Theuns, J. Schaye, and M. Haehnelt, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **315**, 600 (2000), arXiv:astro-ph/9908288 [astro-ph].
- [154] A. Garzilli, A. Boyarsky, and O. Ruchayskiy, (2015), arXiv:1510.07006 [astro-ph.CO].
- [155] A. Loeb and M. Zaldarriaga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 211301 (2004), arXiv:astro-ph/0312134 [astro-ph].
- [156] A. Mesinger, A. Ewall-Wice, and J. Hewitt, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **439**, 3262 (2014), arXiv:1310.0465 [astro-ph.CO].
- [157] T. Sekiguchi and H. Tashiro, *JCAP* **1408**, 007 (2014), arXiv:1401.5563 [astro-ph.CO].
- [158] H. Shimabukuro, K. Ichiki, S. Inoue, and S. Yokoyama, *Phys. Rev.* **D90**, 083003 (2014), arXiv:1403.1605 [astro-ph.CO].
- [159] I. P. Carucci, F. Villaescusa-Navarro, M. Viel, and A. Lapi, *JCAP* **1507**, 047 (2015), arXiv:1502.06961 [astro-ph.CO].